

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

106th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 148

May 26, 1999, 3:24 p.m.  
Page S-6019 Temp. Record

## DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION/Abortions at Overseas Military Facilities

**SUBJECT:** National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000 . . . S. 1059. Smith (of New Hampshire) motion to table the Murray/Snowe amendment No. 397.

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 51-49

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 1059, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000, will authorize a total of \$288.8 billion, which is \$8.3 billion more than requested by the Clinton Administration and which represents a 2.2-percent real increase in defense spending. Highlights include a 4.8-percent pay raise and a \$3.4 billion increase in military construction.

**The Murray/Snowe amendment** would strike the current-law prohibition on using Federal military facilities overseas to perform abortions. That prohibition applies unless an abortion is necessary to save the life of the mother or unless the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. After debate, Senator Smith (of New Hampshire) moved to table the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

The Murray amendment is a solution in search of a problem. Except in extreme cases, abortions at overseas military facilities were banned between 1988 and 1993, and they have been banned again for the last 4 years. No case was ever reported of the earlier ban stopping a woman from getting an abortion, and no case has been reported under the current ban. Our colleagues have their theories, but we will stick with the facts. This ban is not intended to block, nor does it block, the right that the Supreme Court has decided exists for women to obtain abortions. It has nothing to do with whether women may have abortions. Instead, it is about who will pay for them, and it is about recognizing that the issue is so controversial, so divisive, and so emotionally charged that the Federal Government should not be directly involved in performing abortions.

(See other side)

YEAS (51)			NAYS (49)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (49 or 89%)		Democrats (2 or 4%)	Republicans (6 or 11%)		Democrats (43 or 96%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Hutchinson	Breaux	Chafee	Akaka	Kennedy		
Allard	Hutchison	Reid	Collins	Baucus	Kerrey		
Ashcroft	Inhofe		Gorton	Bayh	Kerry		
Bennett	Kyl		Jeffords	Biden	Kohl		
Bond	Lott		Snowe	Bingaman	Landrieu		
Brownback	Lugar		Specter	Boxer	Lautenberg		
Bunning	Mack			Bryan	Leahy		
Burns	McCain			Byrd	Levin		
Campbell	McConnell			Cleland	Lieberman		
Cochran	Murkowski			Conrad	Lincoln		
Coverdell	Nickles			Daschle	Mikulski		
Craig	Roberts			Dodd	Moynihan		
Crapo	Roth			Dorgan	Murray		
DeWine	Santorum			Durbin	Reed		
Domenici	Sessions			Edwards	Robb		
Enzi	Shelby			Feingold	Rockefeller		
Fitzgerald	Smith, Bob			Feinstein	Sarbanes		
Frist	Smith, Gordon			Graham	Schumer		
Gramm	Stevens			Harkin	Torricelli		
Grams	Thomas			Hollings	Wellstone		
Grassley	Thompson			Inouye	Wyden		
Gregg	Thurmond			Johnson			
Hagel	Voinovich						
Hatch	Warner						
Helms							

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

The Defense Department has a large number of elective medical procedures for which it will not pay. Any member of the military or their dependents, if they wish, may take leave, fly to a country in which any of those procedures are available, and pay for them themselves. It is a simple, common practice. In fact, because it is so easy to obtain leave and travel, the Defense Department is not aware of any single problem ever arising from this policy of not performing abortions at overseas facilities.

The only effect of this policy has been to stop the United States from being directly involved in paying for and performing abortions on demand, for any reason. Many Americans (including many of us) have very strong, moral objections to abortions, and nearly all Americans have very mixed feelings. Many Americans support abortions in extreme situations as being the lesser of two evils, but in most other cases they are against it. For instance, they oppose using abortion as a method of birth control, they oppose it for economic reasons, and they oppose late-term abortions. Even the most strident proponents of legal abortions are quick to claim that they think that abortions should be rare. Thirty-five million unborn babies--an entire generation--have lost their lives since the Supreme Court, in its 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision, discovered a right to abortion "emanating" in the Constitution's "penumbra." Only a truly misguided individual would find anything comforting in that grim fact.

In 1979, the Hyde amendment was passed to stop taxpayer funding of abortions. In *Harris v. McCray*, the Supreme Court ruled that refusing taxpayer funding of abortions is legal; it decided that the right to an abortion that it had discovered a few years earlier did not include the right to tax people to pay for it. Defense facilities are paid for by the taxpayers. The buildings, the equipment, the supplies, and the doctors' salaries are all paid for through the defense budget. If an abortion is performed at a defense facility, even if the woman pays for it, the taxpayers still bear part of the burden because they have paid for all of the facilities and they pay that doctor's salary.

Further, assuming that it were somehow possible to relieve the taxpayers of having to pay for abortions performed at military hospitals, they still should not be performed. The United States should not in effect become a hired abortionist. Abortion may be legal, but that does not mean that the American people want to see their Government become an abortion provider. This issue is too controversial. We should preserve the separation that currently exists. The Supreme Court has said that abortion is legal as an individual, private matter, but that does not mean that the Government, which represents all Americans, should disregard the feelings of pro-life Americans by directly involving itself in the performance of abortions.

The stated purpose of the Murray/Snowe amendment is to remove restrictions on military personnel's access to abortion. No such restrictions exist. The effect of the amendment would be to involve the Federal Government, which represents all Americans, most of whom favor at least some restrictions on abortion, in the performance of abortions on demand. The Federal Government should not be directly involved in the performance of abortions against the wishes of so many Americans. We therefore strongly oppose the Murray/Snowe amendment.

**Those opposing the motion to table contended:**

The Murray/Snowe amendment would repeal the language adopted 4 years ago that prohibits military personnel and their dependents from exercising their constitutional freedom to choose at overseas military bases, even when they pay for the abortions themselves. Due to the unavailability of abortions in many countries in which the United States has military facilities, the current-law prohibition effectively nullifies the right for some American women to have an abortion. When they are overseas, they lose their constitutional right. Our colleagues tell us that military women who decide to have abortions and who are stationed in countries that outlaw abortions need only fly to the United States or other countries to have their abortions. While it is true that they can take leave and that while on leave they can fly on military planes for free, it is also true that this arrangement raises numerous troubling issues. Why should a woman, who has made the difficult, personal choice of having an abortion, have to go to her commanding officer and ask for leave? Commanding officers are frequently going to be more or less willing to give leave depending on the reasons for which it has been requested. If a woman were just allowed to go to a local military hospital for an abortion, her commanding officer would not have to review her leave request over this matter which she might rather not discuss. Also, a woman might have to wait for a period of days or weeks before she received leave or before she was able to get a free flight to the United States or some other country where abortion is legal. Once a woman has made this difficult choice, making her wait before she exercises it places an undue burden on her, and is thus unconstitutional under *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. Even when a woman is in a country in which abortion is freely available, like Japan, it is unjust and dangerous to make her go to a hospital where she may not even be able to find anyone who can speak English. A final point that needs to be considered is that this policy ends up costing the taxpayers money. If a woman does not go on leave but instead has an abortion that she pays for at a local military hospital, the taxpayers do not have to pay the cost of her military transport. The bottom line is that military women, who are putting their lives on the line for their country, are having their constitutional rights infringed. The Murray/Snowe amendment would correct this wrong.